

CHECKLIST ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT	
Project Name: Install a new fence on School Trust land.	Proposed Implementation Date: June 2016
Proponent: Brock Fauth, 177 Fuhrmann Rd., Glasgow MT 59230	
Type and Purpose of Action: The applicant proposes to install a new fence on School Trust land which he leases, with the purpose of separating grazing acreage from agricultural acreage.	
Location: Section 3, Township 33N, Range 40E	County: Valley

I. PROJECT DEVELOPMENT	
1. PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT, AGENCIES, GROUPS OR INDIVIDUALS CONTACTED: Provide a brief chronology of the scoping and ongoing involvement for this project.	The proponent contacted Glasgow Unit Office personnel about the project and it was agreed that the improvements would benefit the lessee and use of the resources on the State land.
2. OTHER GOVERNMENTAL AGENCIES WITH JURISDICTION, LIST OF PERMITS NEEDED:	DNRC manages the surface of these lands and no other agencies have jurisdiction over the project. No additional permits needed.
3. ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED:	<p>Action Alternative: Grant permission to the applicant to install a new fence on State land.</p> <p>No Action Alternative: Deny permission to the applicant to install a new fence on State land.</p>

II. IMPACTS ON THE PHYSICAL ENVIRONMENT	
RESOURCE	POTENTIAL IMPACTS
4. GEOLOGY AND SOIL QUALITY, STABILITY AND MOISTURE: Are fragile, compatible or unstable soils present? Are there unusual geologic features? Are there special reclamation considerations?	The area of impact contains mostly a Phillips-Kevin complex of soils, which are loams and clayey loams on 2 to 8 percent slopes. These soils are not unusual, fragile or unstable.

II. IMPACTS ON THE PHYSICAL ENVIRONMENT	
	<p>Action Alternative: The proposed fence would have very minimal impact to soils on the State land.</p> <p>No Action Alternative: Under this alternative there will be no changes to soils on the State land.</p>
<p>5. WATER QUALITY, QUANTITY AND DISTRIBUTION: Are important surface or groundwater resources present? Is there potential for violation of ambient water quality standards, drinking water maximum contaminant levels, or degradation of water quality?</p>	<p>There are no important surface or groundwater resources in the area, and no special consideration of water quality standards, etc.. is necessary.</p> <p>Action Alternative: The proposed fence would not negatively impact the quality, quantity and distribution of water.</p> <p>No Action Alternative: Under this alternative, there will be no impacts to water quality, quantity and distribution.</p>
<p>6. AIR QUALITY: Will pollutants or particulate be produced? Is the project influenced by air quality regulations or zones (Class I airshed)?</p>	<p>Action Alternative: The proposed fence project will have no impact on air quality, nor is it influenced by air quality regulations.</p> <p>No Action Alternative: Under this alternative there will be no impacts to air quality.</p>
<p>7. VEGETATION COVER, QUANTITY AND QUALITY: Will vegetative communities be permanently altered? Are any rare plants or cover types present?</p>	<p>The area of impact is cropland that produces small grains and the occasional pulse crop, as well as grazing land that consists primarily of non-native grasses.</p> <p>Action Alternative: No permanent alteration of the vegetative community is expected to occur.</p> <p>No Action Alternative: Under this alternative there will be no impacts to the plant communities on the State land.</p>
<p>8. TERRESTRIAL, AVIAN AND AQUATIC LIFE AND HABITATS: Is there substantial use of the area by important wildlife, birds or fish?</p>	<p>The State land provides habitat for upland birds and antelope. There is limited potential for recreation on this State land, due to its close</p>

## II. IMPACTS ON THE PHYSICAL ENVIRONMENT

	<p>proximity to a state highway.</p> <p>Action Alternative: The proposed fence will have minimal impact to wildlife in the area. Antelope movements across the area may change slightly.</p> <p>No Action Alternative: Under this alternative there will be no impacts to the possible use of the State land as wildlife habitat.</p>
<p>9. UNIQUE, ENDANGERED, FRAGILE OR LIMITED ENVIRONMENTAL RESOURCES: Are any federally listed threatened or endangered species or identified habitat present? Any wetlands? Sensitive Species or Species of special concern?</p>	<p>Swift fox is the only species of concern listed as being present in the area. There are no sensitive plants present in the area. No wetlands or sensitive habitat is in the area of impact.</p> <p>Action Alternative: The proposed fence would have no impact on important species or habitats.</p> <p>No Action Alternative: Under this alternative there will be no impacts to the environmental resources.</p>
<p>10. HISTORICAL AND ARCHAEOLOGICAL SITES: Are any historical, archaeological or paleontological resources present?</p>	<p>There are potential stone surface features near the area of impact. These potential features were noted as part of the standard renewal process (field evaluation).</p> <p>Action Alternative: The proposed fence will not directly impact the potential stone features, though vehicle use as part of the installation may have an impact.</p> <p>No Action Alternative: There will be no impact to historical or archaeological sites under this alternative.</p>
<p>11. AESTHETICS: Is the project on a prominent topographic feature? Will it be visible from populated or scenic areas? Will there be excessive noise or light?</p>	<p>The area of impact is right along Hwy. 24 as well as a county road, so it is very visible to the public. However, the area is very rural and fences along field edges are a common occurrence.</p>

II. IMPACTS ON THE PHYSICAL ENVIRONMENT	
	<p>Action Alternative: The proposed project will not significantly alter the aesthetics of the land.</p> <p>No Action Alternative: Under this alternative there will be no impacts to aesthetics associated with the State land.</p>
<p>12. DEMANDS ON ENVIRONMENTAL RESOURCES OF LAND, WATER, AIR OR ENERGY: Will the project use resources that are limited in the area? Are there other activities nearby that will affect the project?</p>	<p>Action Alternative: The proposed project would place no additional demands on any environmental resources in the area.</p> <p>No Action Alternative: Under this alternative there will be no additional demands placed on environmental resources of land, water, air or energy.</p>
<p>13. OTHER ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENTS PERTINENT TO THE AREA: Are there other studies, plans or projects on this tract?</p>	<p>The State land is managed for the grazing of livestock and the production of small grains and pulse crops. There are no other studies, plans or projects on the State land.</p> <p>Action Alternative: This project will benefit both the lessee and Glasgow Unit staff, by providing better control over distribution of livestock.</p> <p>No Action Alternative: Under this alternative there will be no impacts to the plans or studies that Montana Department of Natural Resources and Conservation has on the State land.</p>

III. IMPACTS ON THE HUMAN POPULATION	
RESOURCE	POTENTIAL IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES
<p>14. HUMAN HEALTH AND SAFETY: Will this project add to health and safety risks in the area?</p>	<p>Action Alternative: The proposed project will not add to human health and safety risks in the area.</p> <p>No Action Alternative: Under this</p>

	alternative there will be no impacts to human health or safety.
15. INDUSTRIAL, COMMERCIAL AND AGRICULTURAL ACTIVITIES AND PRODUCTION: Will the project add to or alter these activities?	<p>Action Alternative: The fence will improve rangeland quality by providing greater control over livestock grazing use of the tract.</p> <p>No Action Alternative: Under this alternative there will be no impacts to agricultural activities on the State land.</p>
16. QUANTITY AND DISTRIBUTION OF EMPLOYMENT: Will the project create, move or eliminate jobs? If so, estimated number.	<p>Action Alternative: The project will not create nor impact any jobs in the area.</p> <p>No Action Alternative: There will be no impact to quantity and distribution of employment under this alternative.</p>
17. LOCAL AND STATE TAX BASE AND TAX REVENUES: Will the project create or eliminate tax revenue?	<p>Action Alternative: The project will have no impacts on the local and state tax base and tax revenues.</p> <p>No Action Alternative: There will be no impact to the local and state tax base under this alternative.</p>
18. DEMAND FOR GOVERNMENT SERVICES: Will substantial traffic be added to existing roads? Will other services (fire protection, police, schools, etc) be needed?	<p>Action Alternative: The project will not create an additional demand for government services, nor will it impact traffic along existing roads.</p> <p>No Action Alternative: Under this alternative there will be no additional demand for government services.</p>
19. LOCALLY ADOPTED ENVIRONMENTAL PLANS AND GOALS: Are there State, County, City, USFS, BLM, Tribal, etc. zoning or management plans in effect?	<p>Action Alternative: The project has already cleared State (GUO) management plans before implementation.</p> <p>No Action Alternative: Under this type of alternative there will be no impacts on locally adopted environmental plans and goals.</p>
20. ACCESS TO AND QUALITY OF RECREATIONAL AND WILDERNESS ACTIVITIES: Are wilderness or recreational areas nearby or accessed through this tract? Is	Action Alternative: There is little potential for recreation within the tract and surrounding areas, due to the proximity of Hwy. 24. The project would have no impact on this

there recreational potential within the tract?	<p>potential.</p> <p>No Action Alternative: There will be no impacts to the recreational values associated with the State land under this alternative.</p>
21. DENSITY AND DISTRIBUTION OF POPULATION AND HOUSING: Will the project add to the population and require additional housing?	<p>Action Alternative: The project will not impact the density and distribution of population and housing.</p> <p>No Action Alternative: There will be no impacts to the density and distribution of population and housing.</p>
22. SOCIAL STRUCTURES AND MORES: Is some disruption of native or traditional lifestyles or communities possible?	<p>Action Alternative: The project will not disrupt the traditional lifestyles of the local community.</p> <p>No Action Alternative: There will be no impacts to the social structures under this alternative.</p>
23. CULTURAL UNIQUENESS AND DIVERSITY: Will the action cause a shift in some unique quality of the area?	<p>Action Alternative: The project will not impact the cultural uniqueness and diversity of this rural area.</p> <p>No Action Alternative: There will be no impacts to the cultural uniqueness and diversity under this alternative.</p>
24. OTHER APPROPRIATE SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC CIRCUMSTANCES:	<p>Action Alternative: The installation of this fence would allow for greater control of livestock grazing use and should improve the lessee's/applicant's ability to manage the State land.</p> <p>No Action Alternative: There will be no impacts to the economic circumstances under this alternative.</p>

EA Checklist Prepared By: s/Jack Medlicott Date: 10/5/2015  
Jack Medlicott Land Use Specialist

IV. FINDING	
25. ALTERNATIVE SELECTED:	Action alternative
26. SIGNIFICANCE OF POTENTIAL IMPACTS:	No significant impacts anticipated.
27. Need for Further Environmental Analysis: <input type="checkbox"/> EIS <input type="checkbox"/> More Detailed EA <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Further Analysis	

EA Checklist Approved By: Matthew Poole Glasgow Unit Manager  
Name Title

s/Matthew Poole\s Date: May 30, 2016  
Signature